

***Interview Summary***

In an applicant initiated telephonic interview on April 07, 2008 with a follow up session on April 11, 2008, with the applicant's representatives, Eric Barr and Suzuki, the following arguments were presented with regards to claim 19-21 of the present application discussing the prior art Horst et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,932).

As per claim 19, Applicant's representative argued that the Horst reference fails to teach the following limitation:

first controller writes data to said first main-memory and said second sub-memory according to a first write request of said first processor, and at the substantially same time, said second controller writes data to said second main-memory and said first sub-memory according to a second write request of said second processor, wherein said first and second write requests are associated with the same data.

As per claim 20, Applicant's representative argued that the Horst reference fails to teach the following limitation:

when said first processor fails to be in synchronism with said second processor, read access from said first processor is carried out as against said first sub-memory and write access from said first processor is carried out as against said first main-memory, said first sub-memory and said second sub-memory.

As per claim 21, Applicant's representative argued that the Horst reference fails to teach the following limitation:

said first controller copies the contents of said first sub-memory to said first main-memory when said first processor fails to be in synchronism with said second processor.

The Examiner stated that Applicant's representative arguments in view of the above limitation of claim 21 appear to have overcome the Hosrt's disclosed memory copying process. The Examiner and the Applicant's representative agreed to the following amendments to place the application in condition for allowance. Cancellation of claims 20-21 and amending claim 19 to include all of the limitations of claim 20 and claim 21.